



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 28430811

Date: OCT. 05, 2023

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, an entrepreneurial exercise physiologist, seeks classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or of exceptional ability, Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). The Petitioner also seeks a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement that is attached to this employment based second preference (EB-2) classification. *See* section 203(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)(B)(i). U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may grant this discretionary waiver of the required job offer, and thus of a labor certification, when it is in the national interest to do so. *See Poursina v. USCIS*, 936 F.3d 868 (9th Cir. 2019) (finding USCIS' decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding the record did not establish that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest. The matter is now before us on appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will dismiss the appeal.

I. LAW

To establish eligibility for a national interest waiver, a petitioner must first demonstrate qualification for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, as either an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Because this classification requires that the individual's services be sought by a U.S. employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the national interest.

Whilst neither the statute nor the pertinent regulations define the term "national interest," we set forth a framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions in the precedent decision *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884 (AAO 2016). *Dhanasar* states that USCIS may as a matter of discretion grant a national interest waiver of the job offer, and thus of the labor certification, to a petitioner

classified in the EB-2 category if they demonstrate that (1) the noncitizen's proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance, (2) the noncitizen is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, and (3) that on balance it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the noncitizen proposes to undertake. The endeavor's merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact.

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the noncitizen. To determine whether the noncitizen is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, we consider factors including but not limited to the individual's education, skills, knowledge, and record of success in related or similar efforts. A model or plan for future activities, progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor, and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals are also key considerations.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance of applicable factors, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. USCIS may evaluate factors such as whether, in light of the nature of the noncitizen's qualification or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the noncitizen to secure a job offer or for the petitioner to obtain a labor certification; whether, even assuming that other qualified U.S. workers are available, the United States would still benefit from the noncitizen's contributions; and whether the national interest in the noncitizen's contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. Each of the factors considered must, taken together, indicate that on balance it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.

II. ANALYSIS

Whilst the Director found that the Petitioner qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, the Director concluded the Petitioner's substantially meritorious proposed endeavor was not of national importance, nor were they well positioned to advance their proposed endeavor such that on balance a waiver of the requirement of a job offer and labor certification would be beneficial to the United States.

Our authority over USCIS service centers, the office that adjudicated the immigrant petition, is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. So based on a de novo review we will adopt and affirm the Director's decision that the Petitioner did not demonstrate that their proposed endeavor had potential prospective impact rising to a level of national importance. *See Matter of Burbano*, 20 I&N Dec. 872, 874 (BIA 1994); *see also Prado-Gonzalez v. INS*, 75 F.3d 631, 632 (11th Cir. 1996) (joining "every court of appeals that has considered this issue" holding that an appellate body may affirm the lower court's decision for the reasons set forth therein); *Giday v. INS*, 113 F.3d 230, 234 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (noting the practice of adopting and affirming the decision below has been "universally accepted by every other circuit that has squarely confronted the issue"); *Gomez-Mejia v. INS*, 56 F.3d 700, 702 (5th Cir. 1995).

The Director gave individualized consideration to the evidence the Petitioner submitted with their initial petition and their RFE response.¹ We agree with the Director’s well-reasoned decision that the Petitioner does not qualify for a national interest waiver. In *Dhanasar*, we noted that “we look for broader implications” of the proposed endeavor and that “[a]n undertaking may have national importance for example, because it has national or even global implications within a particular field.” *Id.* We also stated that “[a]n endeavor that has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or has other substantial positive economic effects, particularly in an economically depressed area, for instance, may well be understood to have national importance.” *Id.* at 890. The broader implications of the proposed endeavor, national and/or international, can inform us of the proposed endeavor’s national importance. That is not to say that the implications are viewed solely through a geographical lens. Broader implications can reach beyond a particular proposed endeavor’s geographical locus and focus. The relevant inquiry is whether the broader implications apply beyond just narrowly conferring the proposed endeavor’s benefit. The Petitioner’s endeavor would function as a fitness company (featuring fitness, bodybuilding, dance, and team sports) offering a range of individual and group exercise classes for individuals of all ages and fitness levels including those people with special needs, people with a disability, and people with health conditions. The Petitioner identified the beneficial impact to the national interest of their proposed endeavor through broader benefits generally implicating better public health, job creation, tax revenue, and efficient business operations. But the record did not adequately demonstrate that these benefits, even if realized, would impact their field beyond the individuals utilizing their services or employed in the furtherance of their endeavor. So the record as it is currently composed does not indicate that these prospective benefits rose to a level of national importance either through their broader implications influencing matters in the national interest or potential positive economic effects, such as influencing greater employment levels in historically high unemployment areas.

III. CONCLUSION

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, consideration of the remaining prongs of *Dhanasar* would serve no legal purpose. So we hereby reserve them. See *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (“courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach”); see also *Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternate issues on appeal where an applicant is otherwise ineligible). We conclude that the Petitioner does not merit a favorable exercise of discretion to waive the requirement of a job offer, and therefore a labor certification.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹ While we may not discuss every document submitted, we have reviewed and considered each one.